

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION

MINUTES OF THE INFORMAL MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
HELD THURSDAY, 13 FEBRUARY 1986, AT 8:00 P.M.
IN H-333-6, HALL BUILDING, SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS CAMPUS

1. Call to Order and Roll Call:

Acting Chairperson Scott White called the meeting to order at 8:35 p.m.
There was no quorum.

PRESENT:

Co-Presidents:

Ron Hiscox
Michael Judson

Arts and Science:

Maria Calderone
Adrian Chomenko
Andy King
Heather Rerrie
Jim Schneider
Jennifer Stark
Karen Takacs

Commerce:

Jenny Rice (9:00)

Engineering:

Martin Periera (9:45)

Fine Arts:

Ian Chuprun

ABSENT:

Arts and Science: Milva D'Aronco, Maki Kusano, Lorne Lecker, Chris Mostovac, Mark Pink

Commerce: Elizabeth Laett, Shirleen Weekes, Tony Ghannamy

Engineering: Dan Artola, Andrew Haberl, Jonathan Jolivet

Fine Arts: David Etherington, Ian Fleet, Page Lopez

Advisors to the Board Present: Francois Desrosiers, External V.P.; Peter Wheeland, Communications V.P.; Brian Weihs, Finance V.P.; Lorne Woods, Programming V.P.; Glen Cheverie, Liaison Committee; Jim Locke, Liaison Committee.

2. Approval of Agenda:

There was no Agenda distributed. Acting Chairperson Scott White announced that the first item of business would be to set the number of seats for the Board of Directors, and the second item of business would be to discuss the referendum questions. These questions are, in order of discussion, (a) ANEQ, (b) newspaper autonomy, (c) Capital Campaign contributions, (d) By-Law 3: CUSA Membership, (e) By-Law 8.2: CUSA Fees, (f) By-Law 6.2.1: Executive Appointments.

Peter Wheeland advised the Board that the committees (yes/no) for these questions have to be struck next week. He also advised the Board that the Co-Presidents have the powers of the Board between Board meetings, and in this respect, they are able to submit the referendum questions to Judicial Board tomorrow to meet the deadline.

The Agenda was approved as stated.

3. Chairperson's Remarks:

Acting Chairperson Scott White advised the Board that he was acting as Chair because Georges Berberi was unavailable.

4. Setting of Seats for the Board of Directors 1986-87:

Paul Gott, Chief Returning Officer, recommended leaving the number of seats the way they are now: 2 Co-Presidents, 13 Arts and Science, 7 Commerce, 4 Engineering, and 4 Fine Arts (Total 30 Seats). Paul Gott explained that if these seats were divided based on percentage of students, Arts and Science would have 16 seats. However, the Constitution states that not more than one-half of the seats can be assigned to any one faculty, so Arts and Science has the maximum of 13 seats (in case the co-presidents are from the Arts and Science faculty). There were no objections to this setting of seats, however it will have to be ratified at the next duly-convened meeting with quorum.

PROPOSED MOTION FOR NEXT MEETING WITH QUORUM:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the CUSA Board of Directors 1986-87 will be comprised of 30 seats divided as follows:
two Co-Presidents, thirteen Arts and Science Directors,
seven Commerce Directors, four Engineering Directors,
and four Fine Arts Directors.

There were no objections to this proposal. It will be moved at the next duly-convened meeting with quorum.

5. Referendum Questions:

a) ANEQ Referendum Motion:

PROPOSED MOTION FOR NEXT MEETING WITH QUORUM:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following question be submitted to referendum on March 17, 18 and 19, 1986:

"Do you agree with the following:

Whereas Concordia students have been members of the association nationale des etudiants-es du Quebec (ANEQ) for the past three years; and

Whereas, in those three years, ANEQ has regularly ignored the legitimate concerns and criticisms of Concordia student representatives regarding the democracy, financial stability and effectiveness of ANEQ; and

Whereas Concordia student representatives have proposed a series of reforms to ANEQ, to be debated in the coming months;

I agree to give the CUSA Board of Directors the mandate to withdraw from ANEQ membership if, in the opinion of the Directors, ANEQ has not made significant steps towards improving its structures, finances and effectiveness by September 1986.

YES, I agree
NO, I do not agree"

Discussion:

Francois Desrosiers stated that ANEQ has demonstrated a will to change and to come to terms with its organizational problems. This is evidenced in the way in which their finances are straightening out (financial statements now available on a monthly basis). Regarding its structural organization, ANEQ will be holding a congress soon when constitutional changes will be made. ANEQ is now more willing to work with CUSA--the conference on underfunding this weekend is a good example. ANEQ is talking to the government now and voicing its concerns. Regarding the payment of CUSA's membership fee to ANEQ, CUSA will have to pay regardless of whether it pulls out in March or in September. Because of this, Francois Desrosiers feels that CUSA should stay in until September in order to give ANEQ a chance to prove itself. He felt that it would be unfair to the organization and to Concordia students to make a decision before September because such a decision might deprive the students of benefits, such as opportunities to lobby (which are greater when a member of a national organization as opposed to being an independent association.)

Peter Wheeland explained that the basic choice facing the Board would be to go with this referendum question or to pull out now--but pulling out now would eliminate any chance of seeing any changes requested by CUSA (39 Proposals for Reform). If this referendum question does not go through this year, CUSA would have to have a full pull-out referendum next year, and this would mean waiting until next March before CUSA could disaffiliate itself from ANEQ. The referendum question presented above transfers the mandate from the students to the Board to decide whether or not to pull out. This type of referendum gives CUSA power at the next ANEQ congress. If the changes requested in the "39 Proposals for Reform" can be obtained, then it will be worth CUSA's while to stay, but CUSA should not gamble a year waiting to see if these changes take place.

(9:00)

Andy King asked about the membership fees and Francois Desrosiers explained that ANEQ agreed that CUSA would not have to pay the full membership fee because of the referendum, however if ANEQ provides the requested reforms, then CUSA will pay.

Jennifer Stark asked what the relationships were between other student unions and ANEQ. Francois Desrosiers responded that no one is as vocally discontent as CUSA but they are discontent just the same--they face the same problems in voicing their concerns. Jennifer Stark wondered if ANEQ would be able to re-organize in time to counter this discontent and

Francois Desrosiers explained that the executive of ANEQ are aware of the degree of discontent and they are feeling the pressure.

Karen Takacs asked if there was an alternative student association and wondered what the implications would be if this is voted down. Francois Desrosiers explained that it would be a victory for ANEQ if this were the case, and that CUSA would remain members and the Board could re-evaluate the situation in September.

(9:15)

Jim Schneider asked whether McGill belonged to ANEQ or another association, and Francois Desrosiers explained that they are not members of any association at present. Jim Schneider asked if CUSA has to belong to any association. Peter Wheeland responded that CUSA does not have to belong but CUSA should if it is an effective movement going in the direction that CUSA wants.

There were no objections to this proposal. It will be moved at the next duly-convened meeting with quorum.

b) Newspaper Autonomy:

PROPOSED MOTION FOR NEXT MEETING WITH QUORUM:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following question be submitted to referendum on March 17, 18 and 19, 1986:

"I want the student newspapers, The Link and The Concordian, to gain their editorial and financial autonomy through being funded directly by students in the following manner: The CUSA fee of \$1.80 per credit be split into three parts, \$1.60 for CUSA, \$0.13 for The Link and \$0.07 for The Concordian."

YES
NO"

Discussion:

Ron Hiscox explained that this motion entrenches the fee, and that both papers would have to incorporate themselves. Maria Calderone asked how the division of the fee was arrived at, and Brian Weihs explained that the figures represent a slight increase in each paper's budget from last year--the difference in the amounts each paper receives is due to The Link publishing twice a week whereas The Concordian publishes once a week. When asking about responsibility in regard to publishing, Maria Calderone was told that each paper would be its own legal body and therefore responsible for what it prints. Adrian Chomenko wanted to know why the papers should receive increases in their budgets. Brian Weihs explained firstly that there are expenses that come from being incorporated, and secondly that this will enable them to not raise their fees for the next two years or so. Ron Hiscox added that arrangements would have to be made with the papers regarding leases for space and perhaps equipment if it is not sold outright to them. Glen Cheverie suggested that the equipment be leased in case the papers are sued, in which case the equipment would go into trust if it had been sold to them but if it had been leased then CUSA would retain the

equipment. Brian Weihs assured the Board that all the agreements to be signed will be brought to the Board.

(9:45)

Glen Cheverie asked what happened to the negotiating committee that had been formed to deal with this issue. Peter Wheeland explained that the mandate of the committee was unrealistic and it would have been impossible for the committee to negotiate a service contract in so short a period of time. He added that both papers are satisfied overall with this arrangement, except for The Concordian in terms of its fee level. Brian Weihs stated that he hoped the service contract could be worked out by the end of September. Karen Takacs commented that she did not think the question was explicit enough and wanted more information available at the time of voting. Both Ron Hiscox and Brian Weihs did not think it would be feasible to put more information on the ballot (too confusing), but felt that posters, etc. could be put up so that the voters could be fully informed.

There were no objections to this proposal. It will be moved at the next duly-convened meeting with quorum.

c) Capital Campaign Contribution:

PROPOSED MOTION FOR NEXT MEETING WITH QUORUM:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following question be submitted to referendum on March 17, 18 and 19, 1986:

"Are you in favour of a mandatory \$1.00 per credit contribution to support the Concordia University Library Capital Campaign, this fee to be in effect for the next four academic years, but it must be renewed by referendum every Spring.

YES
NO"

Discussion:

Karen Takacs stated that she is vehemently opposed to this proposed motion. She stated that perhaps 2,000 students would vote on this if it were a referendum question, and that these 2,000 do not have the right to impose this on the 25,000 other students--some of whom may not be able to afford the fee. Jim Schneider voiced his support of Karen Takacs' view.

Ron Hiscox responded that this question has never been put to the students before. He further stated that everyone will benefit from the new library and wondered why only some should pay when everyone benefits. In his opinion, everyone should pull together.

Glenn Massad asked why the onus was on the student government to raise this money and wondered whether the University could do it less publicly. Ron Hiscox explained that the Board of Governors has never put on a fee without the approval of the student government, although in theory it could.

Peter Wheeland reminded the Board that it was discussing whether students should have the right to vote on this issue, not whether the Board likes this motion. He stated the need for a student mandate in order to have full "participatory democracy" and added that this would give the Board a clear indication of what the students think.

Karen Takacs stated that the Capital Campaign Contribution could conceivably run as it is at present, as a voluntary fee. Jim Schneider suggested the wording be changed to voluntary, not mandatory, in order to keep it democratic. Heather Rerrie added that a voluntary fee would be better than a mandatory one in her opinion. Ron Hiscox stated that if it is a voluntary fee, then it will not be known if or how much the students will contribute.

Martin Pereira asked how many students had requested refunds this year, and Ron Hiscox stated that it was about 25%.

(10:00)

Karen Takacs stated that this will affect all students whether or not they have anything to do with CUSA. Brian Weihs responded that if we are operating on a basis of democracy, we can assume that those who do not vote do not care. Ron Hiscox stated that it will not necessarily be only 2,000 who vote out of the 25,000, and added that everyone will be benefitting so why should one group get out of paying their share. Karen Takacs responded by stating that contributions to the library should not be the students' burden and that the government should be paying.

An informal vote was taken on this proposed motion (7/2/3) and as a result, this proposal will be moved at the next duly-convened meeting with quorum.

f) By-Law 6.2.1: Executive Amendments:

PROPOSED MOTION FOR NEXT MEETING WITH QUORUM:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the CUSA Board of Directors approves the following amendment to the CUSA by-laws and that such amendment be submitted to referendum on March 17-19, 1986:

6.2.1. The Board of Directors shall appoint an Executive from the members. The Executive shall be responsible for at least the following areas: the finances of the Association, educational matters, external relations, programming, student services, and part-time student affairs. Members of the Executive shall be given appropriate titles and shall be answerable to the Co-Presidents and the Board of Directors of the Association. The Board of Directors may appoint additional Executive members as it sees fit.

The current Article 6.2.1 reads as follows:

6.2.1. The Co-Presidents shall appoint an Executive from the members, which appointment shall be ratified by the Board of Directors. The Executive shall be responsible for at least the following areas: the finances of the Association, educational matters, external relations, programming, student services, and part-time student affairs. Members of the

Executive shall be given appropriate titles and shall be answerable to the Co-Presidents of the Association. The Co-Presidents may appoint additional Executive members as they see fit, subject to the ratification of the Board of Directors.

(10:15)

Discussion:

Karen Takacs explained that this proposal was a recommendation from the Appointment and Hiring Committee, and that it requires a constitutional change.

Peter Wheeland explained that this amendment is being proposed in order to establish clearly that the Vice-Presidents are appointed by the Board and are responsible to the Board and that it is not the Co-Presidents' Executive but the Board's Executive.

Mike Judson stated that the Vice-Presidents should report to the Co-Presidents on a day-to-day basis for operational efficiency, but agreed that they should also report to the Board.

There were no objections to this proposal. It will be moved at the next duly-convened meeting with quorum.

e) By-Law 8.2: Setting of CUSA Fees:

PROPOSED MOTION FOR NEXT MEETING WITH QUORUM:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following amendment to the CUSA By-laws be subject to a referendum vote concurrent to the Winter 1985-86 CUSA General Election:

That the current article 8.2 be amended to read:

"The association fee shall be set by referendum. Notwithstanding by-law 17.6, the Board of Directors shall have the sole authority to propose the amount of the fee."

This will replace the current clause 8.2 which reads:

"The Board of Directors shall set the amount to be paid by members of the association. Two-thirds of the Directors present at a duly-convened meeting must approve such amount."

Discussion:

Ron Hiscox explained that this amendment would make it more difficult to raise the fee and that it was being proposed as a "housekeeping" measure--there is no crisis at present but it should be set for the future.

There were no objections to this proposal. It will be moved at the next duly-convened meeting with quorum.

d) By-Law 3: CUSA Membership:

PROPOSED MOTION FOR NEXT MEETING WITH QUORUM:

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following question be submitted to referendum on March 17, 18 and 19, 1986:

"Do you agree to the following amendment to CUSA's by-laws:

That the current article 3 be renumbered 3.1 and that a new article be added which shall read:

3.2 Notwithstanding by-laws 3.1 and 8.1, the Board of Directors may grant membership status to registered undergraduate, independent and special students who have not paid the Association fee. Two-thirds of the Directors present at a duly-convened meeting must approve the granting of such membership status.

YES, I agree

NO, I do not agree"

Discussion:

Ron Hiscox explained that this is the official wording of the question that was agreed upon at the last Board meeting regarding the Engineering and Computer Science students and "The Sparklers".

There were no objections to this proposal. It will be moved at the next duly-convened meeting with quorum.

(10:30)

In closing, Ron Hiscox stated that in the absence of the Board, the Co-Presidents will bring these questions to Judicial Board for the referendum. At the next duly-convened meeting with quorum, these motions will have to be voted on. If these motions are not carried, they will be pulled out of the referendum.

6) Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:31 p.m.


G. Scott White, Acting Chairperson


Jo Howard, Recording Secretary